



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/507,506	12/13/2004	Moritz Rossner	085449-0150	6374

22428 7590 11/29/2006

FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP  
SUITE 500  
3000 K STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

SWOPE, SHERIDAN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1652

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/507,506

Applicant(s)

ROSSNER ET AL.

Examiner

Sheridan L. Swope

Art Unit

1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 61-122 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 61-122 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 61-122 are pending.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, Claims 61- 85, 90, 92-94, drawn to a cellular method for detecting protein/protein binding using a reporter system.

Group II, Claims 86-88, drawn to a cellular method for detecting protein/protein binding by reconstituting protease activity.

Group III, Claims 89, drawn to a cellular method for detecting protein/protein binding using a reporter system that is regulated by a protease.

Group IV, Claims 91, drawn to a cellular method for detecting protein/protein binding using a reporter system whose cellular location is regulated by a protease.

Group V, Claims 95-106, drawn to a cellular method for detecting protein/protein disassociation using a reporter system.

Group VI, Claims 107, drawn to a method for identifying modulators of protein/protein association.

Group VII, Claims 108-115, drawn to a recombinant host cell.

Group VIII, Claims 116, drawn to a kit.

Group IX, Claims 117 and 120, drawn to a kit.

Group X, Claims 118 and 121, drawn to a kit.

Group XI, Claims 119 and 122, drawn to a kit.

Art Unit: 1652

For each of Inventions I-XI above, restriction to one of the following is also required under 35 USC 121. Therefore, election is required of one of Inventions I-XI and one of Inventions (A)-(H), as indicated.

If Invention I is elected, elect one of:

- (A.) Recombinase
- (B.) Protease
- (C.) Recombinase and Protease

If Invention VIII is elected, elect one of:

- (D.) A recombinase
- (E.) A transcription factor
- (F.) A proteolytically responsive reporter
- (G.) A proteolytically responsive protease
- (H.) A protease gene under transcriptional control

The inventions listed as Groups I-XI do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical feature for the following reasons: The technical feature linking Groups I- XI appears to be that they all relate to methods for detecting protein/protein interaction. However, methods for detecting protein/protein interaction were well known in the art. Moreover, Mitra et al, 1996 teach a cell comprising an expression vector having a proteolytically modulated reporter protein, which anticipates Claim 108. Therefore Groups I-XI share no special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, as it does not define a contribution over the prior art. Furthermore, the products of Groups VII-XI do not share a special common structural and functional feature while, the methods of Groups I-VI do not use the same reagents or produce the same results. In addition, the methods of Groups I-VI do not comprise all of the methods for making or using the products of Groups VII-XI. Accordingly, Groups I-XI are not so linked by the same or a corresponding special technical feature as to form a single general inventive concept.

Searching more than one of Groups I-XI would represent a burden on the Office for the following reasons. Because the products of Groups VII-XI do not share a special structural and functional feature, a search for any one said product would not encompass a search for any other said products. Thus, a search for more than one of the products of Groups VII-XI would be a burden on the Office. A search for any one of the methods of Groups I-VI would not encompass a search for any other said methods because the methods do not share a special technical feature of steps and products used, or results produced. Thus, the search for more than one of Groups I-VI would be a burden on the Office. A search of any one of the products of Groups VII-XI would not encompass a search of any of the methods of Groups I-VI, or vice versa, because said methods are not the only methods of making or using said products. Thus, a search of any one of the products of Groups VII-XI with any of the methods of Groups I-VI would be a burden on the Office.

Art Unit: 1652

These inventions lack Unity of Invention for the reasons given above. Furthermore, each invention has acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter and, thus, searching more than one invention would be a burden on the Office. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes, as indicated, is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the Official Gazette notice dated March 26, 1996 (1184 O.G. 86; see also M.P.E.P. 821.04, *In re Ochiai*, and *In re Brouwer*). Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right, if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. To be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

#### ***Final Comments***

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

To insure that each document is properly filed in the electronic file wrapper, it is requested that each of amendments to the specification, amendments to the claims, Applicants' remarks, requests for extension of time, and any other distinct papers be submitted on separate pages.

It is also requested that Applicants identify support, within the original application, for any amendments to the claims and specification.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheridan L. Swope whose telephone number is 571-272-0943. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F; 9:30-7 EST.

Art Unit: 1652

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Achutamurthy can be reached on 571-272-0928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published application may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on the access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sheridan Lee Swope, Ph.D.  
Art Unit 1656



**SHERIDAN SWOPE, PH.D.**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**